

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LEONARD DORANCE
OSTRANDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 23-cv-10768
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

ADAM GILLEY, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER (1) DISMISSING PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COMPLAINT (ECF No. 14) WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND (2) TERMINATING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 32) AS MOOT

In this action, Plaintiff Leonard Dorance Ostrander brings an excessive force claim against Defendant Adam Gilley, an officer with the Detroit Police Department. (*See* Am. Compl., ECF No. 14.) Now pending before the Court is Gilley’s motion for summary judgment. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 32.) The motion was referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge, and, on June 18, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation in which she recommended that the Court deny Gilley’s motion (the “R&R”). (*See* R&R, ECF No. 32.)

After Ostrander filed his Complaint, the Court issued him a notice that informed him that he was “required, pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR 11.2, to promptly file a notice with the Clerk and serve a copy of the notice on all parties whenever

your address, e-mail address, phone number and/or other contact information changes.” (Notice, ECF No. 5., PageID.30, citing E.D. Mich. Local Rule 11.2.) The notice further warned Ostrander that the “[f]ailure to promptly notify the court of a change in address or other contact information may result in the **dismissal** of your case.” (*Id.*; emphasis in original.)

After the Magistrate Judge issued the R&R, a copy was mailed to Ostrander at the address that he provided the Court. (*See* Dkt.) On July 9, 2024, that copy of the R&R returned to the Court as undeliverable. (*See* ECF No. 38.) Thus, it appears that Ostrander has failed to comply with Local Rule 11.2 and failed to provide the Court his current address. The failure by a plaintiff to update his contact information is not a mere technical violation of the rules. Without a current address or accurate contact information, the Court has no way of administering this civil action.

Accordingly, because Ostrander has failed to comply with Local Rule 11.2 by providing the Court his current address, the Court will **DISMISS** Ostrander’s Amended Complaint (ECF No. 14) **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. In addition, because the Court is dismissing Ostrander’s Amended Complaint, it will **TERMINATE** Gilley’s currently pending motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 32) **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 29, 2024

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on July 29, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126